

## Fordham, Jung and the self: a re-examination of Fordham's contribution to Jung's conceptualization of the self

Elizabeth Urban, *London*

*Abstract:* This paper is about Fordham's contribution to Jung's studies on the self. It opens with the epistemological dilemmas inherent in the subject, before moving on to an account of Fordham's research into the incompatible ways Jung used the term 'self'. There is a description of Fordham's model, which covers his concepts of the primary self, deintegration, reintegration, self objects, self representations, and individuation in infancy. There is a section which discusses areas in which Fordham apparently diverged from Jung, including how these were reconciled by Fordham's developmental approach. These areas include the definition of the self as totality or archetype, the mind-body relationship, the 'ultimate', the origins of the archetypes, and the primary self, the self and the sense of self. It concludes with an extension to Fordham's outline of a resolution to Jung's incompatible definitions. This draws upon the concept of the central archetype of order and how its unfolding is evidenced towards the end of the first year of infancy.

*Key words:* archetypes, central archetype of order, deintegration, infant development, Michael Fordham, primary self, reintegration, self representations.

---

This paper is about Fordham's contribution to Jung's studies on the self. He was well aware that the self is a 'special case' because the subject studying is also the object studied and, moreover, that the observing ego is only a part of the total subject of investigation: '... a concept of the totality is particularly difficult to construct', he noted; 'Indeed it is impossible' (Fordham 1985, p. 21).

Any study of the self presents fundamental dilemmas. In philosophy the self is included under the 'complementarity principle'. Here Heisenberg's uncertainty principle is extended beyond quantum physics to encompass philosophical situations involving properties that appear as particular pairs of opposites, termed canonical conjugates. 'Heisenberg deduced that when this relationship [of canonical conjugates] holds, ... the more determinate or 'sharp' the value of one of the quantities, the *less* determinate (or more 'unsharp') its value for the other quantity' (Bullock & Trombley 2000, p. 893). In Michael Frayn's

play *Copenhagen*, the character Heisenberg discusses the ‘application of complementarity’ to the self (Fraysn 1998, p. 69):

*Heisenberg* [to Bohr] ... Exactly where you go as you ramble around is of course completely determined by your genes and the various physical forces acting upon you. But it’s also completely determined by your own entirely inscrutable whims from one moment to the next. So we can’t completely understand your behaviour without seeing it both ways at once, and that’s impossible. Which means that your extraordinary peregrinations are not fully objective aspects of the universe. They exist only partially ... as our minds shift endlessly back and forth between the two approaches.

(*ibid.*, pp. 69–70)

The *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy* defines the self as ‘the elusive “I” that shows an alarming tendency to disappear when we try to introspect it’ (Blackman 1996, p. 344). Warren Colman referred to the elusiveness and endless shift he encountered in the course of his own study on the self.

Trying to think about the self was like trying to grasp a jelly that keeps slipping out of your hand. Someone pointed out to me that *mercury* would be an apt image of this and I suddenly understood why Mercurius holds such a central position in Jung’s thinking.

(Colman 1999)

Another expression of the elusiveness is the way the concept—an abstraction—shifts easily into reification, and the self becomes a ‘thing’ rather than an idea. Jung had resisted this in his work on religion,

by claiming that all he could know is that psychology could explain much of religion and denying that psychology could be used as an instrument to tell whether God really existed apart from man. This is not a psychological issue at all and could only be tackled by philosophy.

(Fordham 1985, p. 179)

Fordham had tried to be clear that his and Jung’s researches pertained to psychological theory and phenomenology, not ontology. However, as the reader may find, this distinction can easily be lost when studying the self.

### Fordham’s studies of the self

Fordham regarded himself as a scientist. Late in life he reflected, ‘I never really wanted to become a doctor, but rather, after studying natural sciences at Cambridge, was interested in the application of science to medicine’ (Fordham 1988, p. 7). Fordham entered child psychiatry in 1933, just as he was beginning to become involved in Jungian psychotherapy. His earliest papers (1937–1943) reflected his conviction that children are individuals rather than products of parenting, and identified archetypal phenomena in the play,

dreams and drawings of the children he treated. By 1947 he had observed clinically how alternating states of integration and disruption produced ego development in small children and, within ten further years, he had established a model of development based on a deintegrating and reintegrating primary self (Fordham 1957). Fordham's work on the self culminated in *Explorations into the Self*, published in 1985. The volume is a *tour de force* of comprehension, intellect and Fordham's particular kind of vision, and it is disappointing that the editing of this volume did not match the quality of the author's work. Following *Explorations* there were numerous papers and two other volumes; however these were refinements to rather than major revisions of his model.

The first chapter of *Explorations*, titled 'The self in Jung's works', is probably Fordham's most condensed and complex paper. The chapter opens with a notable understatement: 'This first chapter is lengthy and somewhat heavy going...' (ibid., p. 5). Essentially it is a research project attempting to clarify what Jung meant by the self. It originally appeared in 1963, not long after Robert Hobson had published his brief study of how Jung used the term 'archetype' (Hobson 1961). Fordham's study revealed inconsistencies in the way Jung used the 'self', and he sets out to explain how they arose and how they can be resolved.

In the introductory summary, Fordham contends that these incompatible definitions '...stem from the interlacing of primitive experience and the abstractions from them' (ibid., p. 8). Jung's data were subjective affective experiences, symbols and myths derived from clinical experience and comparative studies. When making hypotheses from this data, 'Jung kept his abstract formulations related to empirical affective experiences' (ibid., p. 25) in order for his theory to convey the wholeness for which it was supposed to account. To achieve this, Jung used metaphors. Hence his conceptualization combined directed thinking (the logical form underlying theoretical thought) and undirected thinking (thought, like metaphors, influenced by archetypal processes). Added to this, over time Jung 'ran up against the lack of adequate [scientific] language' for expressing the wholeness of the self, so that later on in his writing he 'relied more and more on paradox' (ibid., pp. 8–9). Fordham criticizes Jung's mixing myth with abstract statement because it devalues the role of theory, when 'theories have advantages over myths in scientific studies...' (ibid., p. 2).

Fordham then reviews Jung's data and points out that the clinical population from which Jung had drawn was not representative. Rather, those involved tended to include exceptional individuals who were introverted, schizoid and some apparently mildly depressed. Jung's data also excluded references to relationships with the external world and internal objects. Lastly, 'there is a signal lack of attempt' to bring in 'material related to childhood let alone infancy' (ibid., p. 17).

Fordham next considers Jung's theories of the self, first as it is defined as the totality of the personality, and then as an archetype. The totality definition

derived from references in Eastern mysticism to states of at-one-ness. However using this as the datum for defining a concept of totality comes up against the epistemological dilemma to which I referred earlier. 'If the self is the whole psyche, then it cannot be observed intrapsychically' because the observing ego is only a part in the whole (ibid., p. 21). Furthermore, as much as Jung needed to base his theories on experiences, 'The difficulties in taking the primordial experience to represent the totality of the psyche are many, but the greatest so far considered is that experiences in solitude, however important in themselves, leave out the organism's adaptation to external objects whether personal or otherwise' (ibid., p. 22).

As for the archetype definition, Fordham notes that it accounts for a range of phenomena related to wholeness (archetypal images) and, in fact, is closer to the data than the totality definition. However this data 'cannot also be the totality' because it excludes the ego, which Jung differentiated from the archetypes. For instance, in *Answer to Job*, Jung (1954) used God to refer to the unconscious (a totality) yet God needs man (the ego, which is not an archetype) to become conscious. Fordham concludes that although '...this definition [self as archetype] is nearer the phenomena described, ...the experience of wholeness is not a reliable basis on which to construct a definition of the self' (Fordham 1985, p. 23).

He then turns to others who have studied the same phenomena. He cites Perry, who observed self images in schizophrenia and considered them in relation to a 'central archetype' (ibid., p. 24). Fordham comments that all the images associated with the central archetype suggest a 'powerful integrative influence', whether in schizophrenia or a well-developed individual (ibid., p. 26).

Fordham's conceptual analysis concludes by returning, full circle, to the introductory comments about Jung's methodology. He asks whether it is acceptable to run two incompatible theories alongside one another: 'Is it enough to say that it is effective [*sic*: affective], pre-logical experience that counts and then play down theory?' (ibid., p. 29). Fordham thinks not. While he appreciates Jung's efforts to maintain the links between the concept and the data it was intended to describe, Jung's 'often graphic word-pictures...are theoretically confusing' (ibid., p. 25).

In a highly condensed paragraph at the end of the section on 'General Psychology' (p. 30), Fordham disentangles Jung's 'interlacing of myth and model' (ibid., p. 7). To summarize it, I shall draw upon the distinction in logic between contradiction and paradox. A contradiction can be stated: A is B and A is not B. It is unresolvable, inasmuch as '...true contradictions indicate some conceptual (theoretical) error'<sup>1</sup>. In contrast, a paradox is an apparent contradiction, the resolution to which can be worked out. When Jung used

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to John Adkins of Jesus College for this concise statement.

paradoxes to capture the nature of experiences of the self, he was referring to contents within a whole, which includes opposites. From this position one can make paradoxical statements such as 'the whole (images and experiences of totality) is in the part (the ego, the observer)' and 'the part (the ego) is in the whole'. However Jung seemed to regard experiences of wholeness *as if* they were actually *of* the totality, ignoring that the whole is beyond experience. Fordham's point is that the 'as if' metaphor (undirected thinking) blurs logical distinctions (directed thinking) that are necessary when defining concepts used in a theoretical model of the self. Theoretical models require clear definitions and logical consistency. In effect Jung was saying that the self is the totality and the self is not the totality (it is a part, an archetype). This, Fordham points out, is a logical contradiction within a theoretical scheme, not a paradox.

Having identified Jung's incompatible concepts of the self, Fordham asks, 'Can a hypothesis be formulated closer to the experiences accumulated and capable of being tested by or used to organize them?' (*ibid.*, p. 31). Here lies Fordham's resolution to the dilemma. I shall develop this later on.

### The model

The model as it stood in its most mature form drew upon several concepts: the primary self, deintegration, reintegration, self objects, self representations, and individuation.

Jung had conceived of the self as a way of accounting for certain, particularly mystical, phenomena in adulthood. Fordham shifts the function of the self within the theoretical model so that it accounts for development, postulating a primary self as the starting point. Certain processes are defined as integral to the central postulate, which account for how development proceeds and contents and structures are formed. These processes, structures and the relationships between them are then used to account for subjective phenomena, including the states of integration for which Jung sought an explanation. Implied in what Fordham writes is that the primary self is also a period of development.

Fordham's starting point is before and beyond all phenomena, and hence refers to a phenomenon-less state. As a postulate, the primary self is a psychosomatic integrate, that is 'empty' of phenomena, so that it is 'nothing but' potential. Rosemary Gordon has described the primary self as 'a simple totality... a matrix of all those potential faculties of the organism which await the process of "deintegration" and "reintegration" in order to become operative and so actualize themselves' (Gordon 1985, p. 267). Mario Jacoby also associates the primary self with potential, describing 'the primary self as the original potential' (Jacoby 2003). Elsewhere I have commented that the primary self might be seen as analogous to the egg at the instant (if there is one) of fertilization, at a moment conceptually held in time (Urban 1992). Astor describes it as 'somewhat analogous to the potential in DNA but probably

without its hereditary constituents' (Astor 1995, p. 50). Unlike the egg at the moment of fertilization but like the cosmic egg to which Fordham had earlier associated it (Fordham 1957), the primary self is a mystical concept, referring to the 'nothing that is everything'. Although the primary self has no representations, there are subjective states associated with it, such as those in early infancy following a satisfying feed, as well as later on, such as mystical states that refer to the 'pregnant absence' expressing the potential that is the essence of the primary self.

The concept implies that the infant is an individual from the start, and that development begins from within, given of course an adequate environmental background. A physiological analogy is the onset of the embryo's heartbeat. As the embryo's first observable activity, at about three weeks, the heartbeat 'initially originates within the heart itself... it is not a response to an external stimulus' (Bremner 1994, p. 25).

Inherent in the concept of the primary self is its dynamic, the complementary processes of deintegration and reintegration that, taken together, Fordham terms actions of the self. Both concepts refer to processes that underlie development. The alternating disruption and stability of deintegration and reintegration can be recognized in a summary hypothesis offered by Thelen from her studies of motor development in early infancy.

... in order to understand development we have to understand that complex systems are self-organizing: they 'prefer' states of equilibrium. However they can be pushed towards new states of equilibrium by particular forces, acting from within the organism or from the external environment. Thus development is understood as a progression through a series of stable states.

(Bremner 1994, p. 47)

As the earliest period in development, the primary self is assumed to operate from before birth. This is substantiated by, amongst others, Piontelli, who made ultrasound observations of foetal development. Her studies show foetuses exploring their intrauterine home, playing with the placenta, touching themselves and, in twinships, their foetal sibling through the membranes that separate them (Piontelli 1992).

Fordham conceptualized deintegration and reintegration in order to account for developmental processes before structures and contents became established. For example, internalization is development of deintegration and reintegration, involving repeated engagements with an experience (deintegration) and assimilating these time and again into the personality (reintegration). He held that initially these actions of the self create a particular state, termed primitive identity, which is meant to account for states of fusion. Recent neuroscientific studies into right brain function have contributed to an understanding of how this state comes about.

Researchers have discovered that it takes 30 milliseconds for an infant to appraise facially expressed emotional cues, 100 milliseconds to detect and

carry out complex processing of change within a human face, and 300–400 milliseconds to mirror and synchronously match the affect of an emotionally expressive face. The same applies for recognizing and matching the emotional qualities of voices (termed ‘prosody’). Within this split second, what is perceived by the infant triggers affect and concomitant bodily responses that are innately connected to expression. So “‘reading’ another’s emotional expression’ entails decoding by ‘actual felt [somatic] emotional reactions to the stimuli...’ (Schoore 2002, p. 27, quoting from Day & Wong 1996, p. 651). Schoore emphasizes how instantaneous perceiving and matching are occurring within both mother and infant engaged together. This results in a mutual mapping process comprised of a ‘very rapid sequence of reciprocal affective transactions [co-constructed] within the intersubjective field’ (Schoore 2002, p. 19). These are experienced subjectively as a state of fusion.

Deintegration produces deintegrates, which are early proto-structures and contents.<sup>2</sup> Deintegration and deintegrates are conceived as processes, structures and experiences that remain part of the self. An analogy is the relationship of the pseudopodia (deintegration and its contents, deintegrates) to the amoeba (the primary self). Early deintegrates are structured within the self via reintegration, which shapes experiences along archetypal lines, that is, within universal human patterns. In time, these proto-structures, which are made up of fragments of similar kinds of experience such as good, bad, ‘I’ and ‘not-I’, coalesce into more stable structures that develop into archetypal forms and the ego. As they all begin as deintegrates, they maintain a fundamental link with the primary self. The neurological understanding behind this is that experiences provoke firings in the brain that over time become wired together, and these wirings, if repeated often enough, become patterned, that is, integrated within the brain into generalized phenomena.

As I have noted, the subjective experience of states of identity is a state of fusion with the other, producing an object Fordham termed a self object. Self objects contrast with ‘reality’ objects:

When the object is mainly a record of reality, it may be called a reality object; when it is mainly constructed by the self and so records states of the self, made out of exteroceptive and introceptive sense data, then it may be called a self object... It appears that self-objects increase in affectively charged states, whilst in quiet contemplative exploring activities real objects predominate.

(Fordham 1985, p. 56)

Conceptually, self objects are closely related to self representations, and Fordham’s use of each has become confused with how other theoreticians have used these terms. Stern describes the infant’s developmental experience

---

<sup>2</sup> The term ‘deintegration’ has proved difficult for those unfamiliar with Fordham. In part this is because it seems to connote an undoing of a negative nature. Fordham intended it to be seen as the unfolding of an integrate that does not un-do development, but instead is an essential part of it.

from the point of view of the emerging ego, beginning with the sense of emergent self. Over time a more coherent sense of self begins to emerge, indicating that the ego has taken on some preliminary form and that mental representations of the self are becoming established. Fordham's position contrasts with developmental theorists who hold that the baby's self representations are derived fundamentally from internalizing the experiences of and with the mother (Stern 1985; Fonagy et al. 2002). In Fordham's model self representations are understood as expressions (representations) of the wholeness of the primary self occurring in the developing ego, that is, conscious awareness. Because it is a product of deintegration and reintegration, the infant's sense of self derives from the infant as well as from interactions with the mother.

To give an example of what is meant by the emergence of self representations in the ego I shall turn to a brief observation. It is of two babies about the same size, although one was five months old and the other eight months. They were sitting near one another on the floor when a large doll was placed between them. Each explored it simultaneously and it began to topple from one to the other. Occasionally when the younger one had the doll, the older one seemed to want it and pulled it his way. The younger one did not get distressed but seemed perplexed that the doll was 'going away', and watched it go with some surprise, clearly unaware that another person was removing it. The younger one never tried to pull away the doll when the older one had it, while the older one did this several times from the younger. The impression is that the older one had a stronger sense of himself, his agency, his wishes and what he felt to be his, while the younger one had not yet reached this point of self-awareness.

Fordham links the infant's developing sense of himself with individuation. He holds that the infant is an individual from the start, so that 'individuation becomes realization of his condition through the development of self representations' (Fordham 1985, p. 54). This is another way of saying that the infant's ego is developing a gradually more discriminated sense of his individuality and wholeness, realized through evolving expressions of the primary self. These expressions are not directly of the self, but via representations of a psychosomatic unity beyond experience, let alone consciousness. In this process the infant's experiences involving various senses of himself are incorporated around a sense of having a centre. Fordham links this centredness back to the original state, re-experienced during early infancy in the sense of wholeness that occurs with, say, pleasurable feeds.

As deintegration and reintegration continue, more stable internal structures and processes develop, leading to greater complexity as these in turn develop. For example, at the end of the first year, the baby begins to understand that when the mother points, she intends for him to look at something. This is the beginning of what developmental psychologists term a 'theory of mind', whereby the baby is able to perceive that the mother has her own motives, intentions and thoughts, in short, a mind behind her face, and this matches a growing sense of his having a mind of his own.



## Discussion

Although Fordham's work is based in Jung, some elements diverge from Jung. Fordham's developmental approach often reconciles apparent differences, as I hope to explain.

### *The definition of the self concept—totality or archetype*

Fordham had pointed out (1963, 1985) Jung's 'incompatible definitions' of the self. Fordham consistently defined the self as the totality of personality. I shall try to give an example of what Fordham meant by the infant being a psychosomatic totality by giving a brief observation of a baby, whom I shall call Jake.

Jake and his mother had been referred for parent-infant therapy and I saw them when Jake was just over a month old. Throughout the session Jake was asleep while his mother and I were talking. From time to time I noticed Jake and what he was doing, which gave the impression of a progression, or unfolding, of development in relation to what was happening around him.

Just as I was entering the room to join Jake and his mother, the door slammed behind me with a loud bang. Jake was asleep in his sling cot on the floor in front of his mother, and he startled at the noise. His whole body jerked forward reflexively as if to curl up protectively, although he did not wake up. A bit later I noticed Jake begin to squirm and buckle forward—a variation of the reflexive curling into himself—after which he stretched out with his arms raised in front of him. He slept soundly again and then wriggled a bit, his face puckering as if working up into a cry, his head gently turning from side to side as if expressing 'no'. He then stretched his arms forward and upward, his fingers extended with palms outward. It appeared as if he was pushing something away, what I presumed was the 'badness' of the noise.

A bit later, as he drifted again into lighter sleep, the pushing away movement was clearly directed toward me, and what I guessed was the 'badness' of my felt presence, which might have been linked with the bang followed by my unfamiliar voice. Still later I observed him making similar yet quite different motions toward his mother. He stretched his arms out toward her but with his fingers extended and palms held downward rather than up, so it looked as if he was reaching rather than pushing away. As I watched, his gestures seemed quite different depending on the direction of his arms; toward me, he pushed away and toward his mother, he reached out.

Here we see a baby relating to what is happening around him in spite of being asleep. It is difficult to say what level of awareness he has, but he is certainly not conscious in the sense we ordinarily mean it. In fact the distinction between conscious and unconscious is irrelevant, and it is useful to consider what is happening in terms of the self. Jake's self is a psychosomatic self,

whereby bodily actions convey that experiences are being internally organized, or differentiated, into 'me' and 'not-me', and 'good' and 'bad' experiences. It is however not an observation of the primary self, only of its expressions via deintegration and reintegration, functioning in a unified way within a separate 'unit' responding to what is going on externally and internally. Furthermore, the experiences are of sensations rather than of mental images.

I am trying to show how Fordham recognized a unity and personhood of the infant. However, might this observation also be seen as an example of the self regarded as an archetype? I shall come to this later in the paper.

### *The mind-body relationship*

Jung seemed divided on the issue of mind and body. Fordham notes, 'At one time Jung conceived the archetype as the psychic representation of instinct only, but he often writes as if they were purely psychic forms' (Fordham 1985, p. 162). In *Psychological Types* Jung defines the self as the psychic totality; 'the self is the subject of my total *psyche* which also includes the unconscious' (Jung 1971, para. 706; my italics). Also, Jung considered psyche and soma as opposites: 'Mind and body are presumably a pair of opposites and, as such, the expression of a single entity whose essential nature is not knowable either from its outward, material manifestation or from inner, direct perception' (Jung 1926, para. 619).

Undoubtedly Jung was aware of a mind-body link because his experimental researches depended on this. These researches drew upon the James-Lange theory of affect, which distinguished between 'emotion' and 'feeling':

I take emotion as affect, it is the same thing as 'something affects you'. It does something to you—it interferes with you. Emotion is the thing that carries you away: You are thrown out of yourself; you are beside yourself as if an explosion had moved you out of yourself and put you beside yourself. There is a quite tangible physiological condition which can be observed at the same time. So the difference would be this: feeling has no physiological or tangible physiological manifestations, while emotion is characterized by an altered physiological condition.

(Jung 1935a, para. 46)

Jung's statement is in line with the thinking of the contemporary neurologist Anthony Damasio, whose research has drawn upon the same theory of affect:

In a typical emotion, then, certain regions of the brain, which are part of a largely preset neural system related to emotions, send commands to other regions of the brain and to almost everywhere in the body proper... The result of these coordinated chemical and neural commands is a global change in the state of the organism. The organs which receive the commands change as a result of the command, and the muscles, whether the smooth muscles in a blood vessel or the striated muscles in the face, move as they are told to do. But the brain itself is changed just as remarkably.

(Damasio 1999, pp. 67–8)

According to Damasio, the brain spontaneously makes a primary mapping of these ‘changes in the body state that are induced in myriad organs’ (Damasio 1994, p. 139). In contrast to emotion, feeling is the imaging of these changes, called secondary mapping. Just how this happens is unknown, although secondary mapping (feelings) might be said to be more clearly psychic than psychosomatic. If the self is considered the *psychic* totality, then by logical extension the concept would exclude emotions, and this makes no sense. If emotions are included in the notion of psyche, then the body is necessarily involved. According to Damasio, to ‘feel the feeling’, consciousness as well as primary and secondary mapping are required, that is, consciousness is based on psychosomatic elements.

Fordham addresses the mind-body question developmentally. He regards the self as a psychosomatic entity, which over time deintegrates and reintegrates into mental and physical functioning. ‘In treating these twin concepts, psyche and soma, as deintegrates, their origin in the self is not lost sight of, nor is their adaptive value left out of account’ (Fordham 1985, p. 170). When Jung states (in places), and other Jungians imply, that the self is ‘only’ psychic, it may be because they work primarily with adults. Throughout Fordham’s career he worked with children and was aware of how bodily their expressions are—touching, running, stroking, climbing, biting, hitting and spitting. His developmental model was intended to cover the continuity between childhood and adulthood, and the bodiliness of the mind throughout life was integral to his thinking.

### *The ‘ultimate’*

Both Jung and Fordham commented on a state to which they referred as ‘the ultimate’. Jung’s reference is in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, when he is describing his experiences following the break up with Freud. He wrote, ‘Only gradually did I discover what the mandala really is: “Formations, Transformations, Eternal Mind’s eternal recreation” . . . In them I saw the self—that is my whole being—actively at work . . . [in them]. I had attained what was for me the “ultimate”’ (Fordham 1985, p. 12, taken from Jung 1963, pp. 187–8).

Fordham’s comment on ‘the ultimate’ is as follows:

... a reflection on ‘the ultimate’. I take it to represent a state in which there is no past and no future, though it is present like a point which has position by [*sic*: but] no magnitude. It has no desires, no memory, no thoughts, no images but out of it by transformation all of these can deintegrate. There is no consciousness so no unconscious—it is a pregnant absence.

(Fordham 1985, p. 33)

The ‘ultimate’ described in each quote refers to mystic states, which both Jung and Fordham studied. Jung’s work was extensive and well known, while Fordham’s lesser known studies focused on the experiences described by

St. John of the Cross. As Astor describes, Fordham saw similarities (as well as important differences) between the process described by the saint (the *scala mystica*) and individuation (Astor 1995). Noting that 'the past never disappears it is transformed', Fordham traces 'ultimate' union with God to its sources in infancy (Fordham 1985, p. 197). This primitive object relationship involves an experience of a good feed leading to the image of a good breast. This occurs developmentally before the infant's capacity for differentiation, thus involving projective and introjective identification. This account explains the subjective experience of union and views the mystical state as a transformation of the earliest state of infancy. Fordham notes, 'That state is nearest to the whole self' (ibid., p. 198).

Fordham's comment on the 'ultimate' comes at the end of the first chapter of *Explorations into the Self* and seems tacked on to what precedes it. In fact, the paragraph was not included in previous editions of the paper (Fordham 1963; Fordham et al. 1973). Why did Fordham add it? I believe that he did so because states of integration were central to Jung's conceptualization of the self and Fordham wanted to include an equivalent state associated with his model. Drawing upon Bion, Fordham refers to a phenomenon-less state, a 'pregnant absence', which presents a contrast to Jung's idea of the 'ultimate'. For Jung, the 'ultimate' is the individuated self experienced as a unity that transcends the multiplicity of object relationships. For Fordham, the 'ultimate' is the primary self, which precedes but contains the potential for and predisposition to develop a multiplicity of objects and relationships with them.

### *The 'origins' of the archetypes*

The old conflict between nature and nurture for a long period divided psychologists into opposing camps of 'nativists', who came down on the side of innateness, and 'empiricists', who came down on the side of the environment. Within the nativist camp, distinctions were made between 'preformationism', whereby 'structures underlying behaviour are there from birth', and 'predeterminism', in which structures develop during childhood through a predetermined sequence of differentiation and elaboration' (Bremner 1994, p. 5). Although Jung and Fordham held that both nature and nurture played a role in development, the distinctions between preformationism and predeterminism may help to clarify a difference between them regarding the 'origins' of the archetypes.

Jung had stressed that the archetypes were *a priori*, as was the archaic substrate of the collective unconscious. To use Barbara Wharton's metaphor (personal communication) archetypes are there from the beginning like a dry river bed ready to receive water and then flow. Jung wrote,

So far as I know, there is no inheritance of individual pre-natal, or pre-uterine, memories, but there are undoubtedly inherited archetypes which are, however, devoid of

content, because, to begin with, they contain no personal experiences. They only emerge into consciousness when personal experiences have rendered them visible.

(Jung 1935b, para. 846)

Here it is implied that the archetypes and the collective unconscious are conceived to be 'there' as innate, 'pre-formed' endowments.

In relation to Jung, Fordham can be seen as a 'predeterminist' (although only in this specific sense). He holds that structures, including body, mind and the structures and processes of each, unfold out of the primary self via deintegration. He writes, '...in infancy the archetypal forms are derived from the self through its deintegration' (Fordham 1985, p. 45).

To expand upon this, I should like to turn to an observation in a video produced by Johnson and Johnson, entitled *The Amazing Talents of the Newborn* (Johnson & Johnson 1998). It shows a series of stills of Andrew, forty minutes after his birth. Andrew has been dried but not washed or given various treatments, so that the smells of the amniotic fluid are still with him. He has been placed on his mother's abdomen and slowly starts climbing towards his mother's breast and face. The narrator relates that as he does so, the movement of his feet stimulates her uterus to 'clamp down' so that the bleeding stops, while also producing the 'love hormone', oxytocin, resulting in powerful feelings of love. Then it is noted how Andrew looks from her face to her right nipple and back to her face again, and, in the little pauses in between, he sucks his fingers. The narrator describes how there are similarities between the smell and taste of the amniotic fluid and what Andrew will smell and taste of his mother's milk. He continues to look from face to nipple and back again, and then, lifting his head to look at his mother's face, he is put just in the right position to latch on to the aureole, which he does. This awesome interplay of nature and nurture is a good way to exemplify what is meant by early archetypal phenomena and its relation to deintegration.

Bremner points out that behaviours like Andrew's may be viewed as innate, or 'pre-wired', 'if we take birth as the starting point, [but] the fetus's activities in the womb may have been involved in the "wiring up" process' (Bremner 1994, p. 36). For instance, the stepping movements that Andrew uses to crawl are now known to be foetal movements, which may be important in preventing the organism from becoming attached to the side of the uterus. Bremner adds, 'So instead of there being just one dramatic neural reorganization following birth, it seems more plausible that, starting in the fetal stage, there are a series of discontinuities brought about as successively higher regions of the brain become functional' (Bremner 1994, p. 37). This can be seen to describe Fordham's idea of how a phenomenon-less, 'empty' primary self develops even before birth.

The observation of Andrew shows the meeting point of nature and nurture. Fordham held that the match between them need not be perfect. Although newborns like Andrew may be capable of what is termed the 'breast crawl', it

is not the actual experience of many babies, in spite of the fact that they do adapt, survive and thrive. Developmentalists refer to this as the newborn's 'flexibility in the range of his affordances', that is, how he makes use of the environment. Fordham believed that the infant also contributes to the environment, and Andrew's stimulation of oxytocin in his mother's bloodstream is a good example of what he meant. However Andrew also contributed to his own development even before birth because foetal stepping produces neural activity and organization in the foetal brain.

If archetypes are the result of deintegration and reintegration, how does Fordham account for the collective in childhood? Firstly, it should be clear by this point that he does not believe that the infant is born with a wealth of collective images which then become projected onto the mother. Nor does he believe that 'The unconscious psyche of the child is truly limitless in extent and of incalculable age' (Jung 1931, para. 95). Instead Fordham turned to Jung's likening of archetypal phenomena to a spectrum covering, at the one end, instinctual life (as with the example of Andrew) and, at the other, spiritual life. For Fordham, expressions of the collective in infancy are best understood in terms of a body mythology, as Melanie Klein had understood and described. As for the spiritual pole, the child's predisposition to 'develop archaic ideas, feelings and fantasies...are influenced and refined by education which in turn, as in feedback systems, provides suitable imagery through which the unconscious archetypes can find expression in consciousness' (Fordham 1976, p. 6). The growing child discovers images around him that contribute to the imagery expressive of the collective. Images become available via the culture at large, such as children's books, television, films and—the therapist's curse—video games. Miranda Davies has referred to the one-sidedness of most of these popular images, and the imbalance of power, speed, and violence at the expense of smallness, dependency and loss (Davies 1993).

Fordham adds, 'In contrast to the instinctual drives, which are relatively fixed and few in number, the fantasy (or spiritual) component has wide and flexible application' (Fordham 1976, p. 6).

### *The primary self, the self and the sense of self*

What is the difference between the primary self and the self? Rosemary Gordon had noted that the primary self 'is a primitive form of the self' (Gordon 1985, p. 267). To this I have added that the primary self is also a period of development. This raises such questions as when does the primary self begin and when is the self no longer primary? In this section, I shall divert in order to clarify certain matters, including Fordham's position in relation to current conflicts amongst Jungians who also take a developmental perspective.

Fordham would not be pinned down in dating the beginning of the primary self, other than to say it occurred before birth. It is important to keep in mind that Fordham postulated a *psychosomatic* integrate. Carvalho warns against

'the danger particularly when the idea of the "self"' is pushed back prior to the formation of a nervous system and its function of apperception, [because] the idea invites theologizing, idealization and inflation' (Carvalho 1985, pp. 237–8). Using 'the formation of a nervous system' as a guide, one might consider the primary self to have beginnings as early as fourteen days after conception, with 'the formation of the primitive streak and therefore the beginning of the development of the nervous system' (Piontelli 1992, p. 109). If one includes apperception, that is, the cognition of a perception, this may change the dating, to say, around seven weeks, when external stimuli to the peri-oral area will produce a response, indicating neural connections have begun to become established.<sup>3</sup> Bremner considers that 'in practice it is often hard to draw a clear line between perceptual and cognitive processes' (Bremner 1994, p. 52). The same is likely to be the case with the beginning of the primary self.

Carvalho is reluctant to use the term 'primary self' 'unless talking about the primary integrate *after* the stage at which it has developed a mind and the functions of mind' (Carvalho 1985, p. 237; my emphasis). He states that "'self" as a term implies some notion of reflectiveness and therefore of mind and awareness' (ibid., p. 236),<sup>4</sup> a position shared by Louis Zinkin. Within Fordham's model, both Jungians are referring to the sense of self.

Fordham distinguished between the self and the sense of self, and for him the difference was major. In 1986 Zinkin published a paper in the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, in which he criticized Fordham's notion of the primary self:

Because Fordham is deeply concerned with babies and how they come to have a *sense* of self, a *sense* of an inside and outside, he posits an original self... which seems to be quite undifferentiated which he sees as deintegrating through an act of spontaneous division.

It is here that I have the greatest difficulty with his theory... the baby is at no time undifferentiated even when it is a foetus [*sic* zygote] consisting of only one cell. As a model or a hypothesis of what takes place in infancy I cannot accept that there is an original self... I can agree with it only as a postulate like 'initial conditions' in systems theory language but would regard such a state as preceding the birth of the individual.

(Zinkin 1986, p. 302)

The article was controversial. James Astor, who is and was at the time an authority on Fordham's work, wrote a letter to the *Journal*, stating, 'The

<sup>3</sup> The peri-oral area is the first part of the body to come 'on-line'. The onset of the response marks the point the embryonic period ends and the foetal period begins (Bremner 1994, p. 25).

<sup>4</sup> The word 'self' is of Anglo-Saxon, Old Saxon and Old Norse origins, and Damasio notes that the term does not occur in romance languages except in the reflexive, such as 'self-reflective', 'self-centred' (Damasio 1999). Nor, I am told, does 'self' occur in the Eastern languages of Hindi and Gugerati.

Winnicottian idea that the original self is undifferentiated is not one that Michael Fordham subscribes to...' (Astor 1987, p. 57).

Zinkin's misunderstanding of Fordham extended to other elements of Fordham's position. Fordham had not postulated a primary self simply in order to account for the sense of self. It was to account for the fundamental unity of the infant before an ego is formed, including the capacity of the infant to relate to and make use of the environment, particularly its human components, as we saw with Jake. Secondly, Fordham had explained that the sense of self arose as self-representations became part of the ego, so only indirectly did it come from the primary self. Thirdly, whether the self is differentiated or not depends on what is meant by differentiation. The sleeping infant Jake could differentiate between his mother and me, but it is unlikely that he had formed stable internal differentiation in terms of self, good, not self and bad.

Following this paper, Fordham initiated a personal correspondence with Zinkin that lasted from January to June of 1987. In his initial letter Fordham wrote:

... you [Zinkin] cannot conceive of a self without a sense of 'I' or 'myself', but Jung persistently denies that his 'self' is that and he regularly distinguishes the ego from the self. ... I was quite horrified at the symposium on the self in the *Journal* [Vol. 30, 3, in which Carvalho's paper had appeared] to see how far our members had departed from Jung in this respect.

(Zinkin 1998, p. 136)<sup>5</sup>

Zinkin responded and Fordham wrote back, enclosing some notes he had made about foetal deintegration and reintegration. They include the following:

Considering the accumulation of data it would seem wrong to assert, as has been widely done and still is in many quarters, that a foetus has no mental life and so no ego even in the later part of gestation, say after five months when his brain is fully formed. Even before this it would be daring to assert that there are no physical elements from which mental life will emerge.

(ibid., p. 139)

Here however Fordham seems to be regarding the primary self as a concept beyond time and space and therefore existence, at the same time as making efforts to date it (in his notes).<sup>6</sup> The correspondence does make clear the strength of his opinion that the self is not the same as the sense of self.

<sup>5</sup> Daniel Stern and Antonio Damasio have in their respective ways also studied the self. Stern and Damasio are careful to use phrases such as 'sense of' or 'feeling' of self, while not getting into the thorny issue of what the self is. Each holds their respective ideas, whether explicit or implied, about an 'emergent' and 'core self' (Stern 1985) or 'proto-self' (Damasio 1999). These are not equivalents to the primary self, but they refer to the same dynamic entity that Fordham postulated.

<sup>6</sup> Fordham's attempts to date the beginning of the primary self imply that the concept also refers to the period of development.



### An extension to Fordham's resolution to Jung's incompatible definition

I shall now return to Fordham's attempt at a resolution of the contradictory meanings Jung attributed to the self. In so doing, I shall address the question of when the primary self is no longer primary.

Fordham concludes his study in the first chapter of *Explorations* with an overly condensed section entitled 'The nature of the self'. I shall expand on this section, which is a reworking of a previous paper (1963, republished in 1973). The chapter was being revised when Fordham was still recovering from a serious illness, when his wife and colleague, Frieda, had become quite infirm and dependent, and while he was under pressure to complete what was undone in his life's work. His purpose in this section of the chapter is to answer the question, 'Can a hypothesis [about what is meant by the self] be formulated closer to the experiences accumulated and capable of being tested by or used to organize them?' (Fordham 1985, p. 31). Fordham's purpose here would be clearer if he had retained the original section heading: 'Attempt at a solution of the theoretical quandary'.

Essentially Fordham's resolution lies in a development approach. Development begins with the primary self, that is, the potential for an individual being with psychosomatic continuity and the capacity to adapt. Deintegration and reintegration lead to the development of stable structures, both somatic and psychic, including an embodied mind and conscious sense of self. This involves the emergence of archetypal structures and forms, and one of particular importance to Fordham's model is the central archetype of order. The term identifying this archetype seemed to be Fordham's way of dealing with the 'problem of nomenclature', that is, the term 'self' had been used to refer to both the archetype and the totality of the self. If a distinction was needed in the conceptualization, one was also needed in the terminology. Fordham had clearly intended the term to be an alternative to what Jung had meant by the archetype of the self. In the original version of what became Chapter 1 in *Explorations* he wrote, 'The central ego has a special relation to what, with some hesitation, may be called the central archetype of order (archetype of the self, in Jung's terminology)' (Fordham 1963, p. 20).

The 'central archetype of order' had been used by Jung and Perry. To my awareness, Fordham had first used the term in a 1962 paper, 'Ego, self and mental health' (Fordham 1962). It is republished in *Explorations* as Chapter 7, 'Mental Health', where he states, 'Turning to the possible ways the archetypes may be related to each other, we at once think of the possibility of a hierarchy subservient to a central organizing system, as Jung suggested when he referred to the self as the central archetype of order' (Fordham 1985, p. 117). Fordham again used the concept in his 1963 research study on Jung's meanings of self, in which he pointed out that Perry had used the term to account for images of wholeness in schizophrenia. Fordham expanded on this, drawing out the integrative function of the central archetype, which is evident in the

individuation process as well as apart from it (in psychosis), and in early development. Fordham also used term in a 1964 paper, 'The relation of the ego to the self', revised as Chapter 6 in *Explorations*. In the revision he writes, 'If the "Ich Gefühl" be considered from the dimension of the ego, then the self appears as part of the ego. But looked at from that of the self, then it would be conceived as manifesting the central archetype of which the ego is a part' (Fordham 1985, p. 108).

It seems that Fordham used the concept of a central archetype of order during the early 1960's, at a time when he was consolidating his model of development. He then dropped the term. It does not appear in either *Children as Individuals* (1969) or *The Self and Autism* (1976), yet it reappears in *Explorations* in the chapters that are revisions of the 1960's papers. Why had Fordham revived the term in *Explorations* and why, once revived, did he not develop it? I suggest that after Fordham started to use 'central archetype of order', he became more involved in, amongst other activities, his clinical research into autism. In his research, Fordham used the concept of self objects to describe the lack of self/other differentiation that was so evident in his clinical studies. He did not need the concept of an archetype distinguished by its function of integration because he was thinking of autism as a problem primarily of deintegration. Why was the idea of the central archetype revived but then not developed? I consider this may be because he realized that the central archetype enabled him to resolve Jung's contradiction via his developmental model and needed to remain. Fordham may not have had the energy to develop it as he progressed into old age, when he needed to prioritize his efforts around the two volumes and numerous reviews, papers and chapters he wrote during the last ten years of his life. He may also not have considered he had the data to develop the concept of a central archetype of order.

I should like to extend the concept as he presented it. To begin, Fordham clearly meant for the central archetype of order to distinguish a particular archetype that has special integrative functions in relation to the archetypes and to the ego. He describes the archetype as follows:

Integration is the main function of the self ([that is,] the archetype of order) . . . That central archetype can be thought of as [*sic*: as] an organizer of the unconscious: it contributes significantly to the formation of the central ego in which it finds expression especially in conscious experiences of selfhood . . . In this formulation, the central archetype, being a part system in the total self, can be introjected, projected, can assimilate other unconscious elements, identify with the ego, be the source of religious experience, the source of the central ego, and function mostly in the unconscious in a compensatory manner until it gets realized, i.e., largely integrated into the ego in individuation . . . At the same time, room is left for the personal life of the individual and his relation to the external world as a whole, within the self conceived of as the superordinate totality.

(Fordham 1985, pp. 31-3)

How might the notion of the central archetype be viewed developmentally? By the end of the first year, most infant researchers agree there is a surge of significant developments. These changes include the beginning of attachment proper, when there is an enhanced awareness of the singularity and significance of the attachment figure, accompanied by the infant's new consciousness of his own individuality and value. Also there are the dawning awarenesses of a theory of mind, mentioned earlier, and the capacity for empathy (Schoré 2002). This period correlates with Stern's domain of subjectivity (that is, of the subjective sense of self), and might be seen as the point at which there is a shift from what Edelman calls primary consciousness, which is shared by most mammals, to secondary consciousness, which includes a basic awareness of one's subjectivity as well as that of another (Edelman 1992). Thus this archetype could be seen to be that of subjectivity, as Young-Eisendrath concludes (Young-Eisendrath & Hall 1991 in Colman 2000). In his study of the self Warren Colman notes, '...it is possible to think of archetypal processes directed towards wholeness and of a "central archetype" whose centring functions involve the organisation and integration of the *psyche* as a whole' (Colman 2000, p. 8, my italics). Following on from this, I am putting forward that the central archetype of order organizes and integrates *psychic* deintegrates.

In summary, there is towards the end of the first year a vast array of evidence indicating a predominance of integrative processes within the infant's emerging mind, leading, amongst other developments, to a new awareness of the sense of self as an individual. This evidence indicates activities of what Fordham conceived as the central archetype of order, which has a special role in shaping and consolidating the ego. By the end of the first year the emerging archetype becomes shaped via deintegration and reintegration into a more coherent processing structure, resulting in numerous new capacities in relation to subjectivity and mindedness. These include a nascent unified sense of self, such as was seen with the two babies and the doll. In this light, what Fordham termed 'representations of the self' might more accurately be considered representations and pre-symbolic expressions of the central archetype of order. As I conceive it, the archetype arises from early actions of the self, perhaps beginning *in utero* and being amongst the earliest to deintegrate, and perhaps based in the physiology of the brain and the way it wires together (integrates) circuits that fire together.

This conception of the archetype means that it is intimately linked to the primary self. Yet they differ in two important respects. The central archetype is a part of the whole and, as such, it can be projected, introjected and so forth as Fordham described (Fordham 1985, p.33). Its primary function is to integrate. In contrast, the primary self and its successor, the self, refers to the whole and functions as an integrator and deintegrator.

When is the primary self no longer primary? Conceived as a period of development, I view the primary self to refer to a period of early development that is predominated by deintegrates, that is, primitive part objects. Through

deintegration and reintegration, contents become both differentiated and consolidated into a more stable ego and internal objects. As the infant begins to have a sense of his own mind and his mother's, internal objects take on a three-dimensional quality and become whole objects in the Kleinian sense. As the changes that begin at the end of the first year develop through the second, one may begin to refer to the self and to its contents and structures by their specific terms within the theoretical model, such as 'ego' or the 'central archetype of order' and so forth. Hence as more clearly defined archetypal structuring occurs, the self moves beyond being primary, although its processes continue throughout life as new deintegrates appear.

## Conclusion

This paper began with some of the difficulties inherent in a study of the self. Jung referred to his circumambulations of the self, and Fordham had his own experiences of the elusiveness of his subject. In their correspondence, Zinkin had written to Fordham, '... when you avoid dating the original self it is not simply that we don't know the date and one day we might find out, but that *it has no date*. In this sense I entirely take your point that it is an abstraction' (Zinkin 1998, p. 142). Fordham answered:

I certainly think that dating the original self is not important and am struck and attracted to your idea that 'it has no date'. That seems the obvious conclusion now you have suggested it. If that is so, and I am persuaded that it is, then can we speak of the self as existing? Against that we put Jung's idea, and that of others, which covers cosmic experiences extending to the limits of space and time. That is what I am talking about, following Jung.

(ibid., p. 143)

Here Fordham seems to find himself caught in the rapid and endless shifts that accompany thinking about the self. He has made it clear to Zinkin that the primary self is an abstraction, or concept. He then slides into wondering if the self is a 'thing' that exists, before shifting rapidly back to it being a mystical concept accounting, as Jung intended, for cosmic and mystical experiences.

Over all Fordham was able to keep his conceptual bearings because of the value he placed on theoretical constructs to further understanding. He wrote during the long period in the twentieth century, when psychoanalysis was defining itself through theory. Fordham appreciated the need to steer a course through the muddles that came from the proliferation of theory that was occurring, and had the clarity of thought to do so. Hence he developed his model in a way that led him to sharpen one aspect, theory, while leaving another, phenomenology, 'more unsharp'. This has begun to change, and analytic thinkers are working to balance theory with human experience, so that they are reaching to literature to expand upon their conceptualizations (Britton 1998; Canham & Satyamurti 2003; Williams & Waddell 1991).

Recently Jean Knox has made a plea to re-establish this 'heart of our theory and practice', and James Astor has presented a paper to the Society of Analytical Psychology Analytic Group, in which he argued that literary descriptions of fictional characters may offer something more authentic about what happens subjectively within and between analyst and patient, than do clinical accounts (Knox 2004, p. 1; Astor 2004).

The enormous changes in developmental psychology and neuroscience that challenge our theories and offer hope of leading forward, can also be seen as part of an endless shift:

... On a huge hill,  
Cragged, and steep, Truth stands, and he that will  
Reach her, about must, and about must go ...

(Donne 1633, p. 163)<sup>7</sup>

---

#### TRANSLATIONS OF ABSTRACT

Cet article s'intéresse à la contribution que Fordham a faite aux études sur le soi de Jung. Il s'ouvre sur les dilemmes épistémologiques inhérents au thème, avant de poursuivre en rendant compte de la recherche faite par Fordham sur les différentes manières dont Jung a utilisé le terme 'soi' et l'incompatibilité de ces différentes significations. Est faite une description du modèle de Fordham, qui recouvre ses concepts de soi primaire, de déintégration, de réintégration, d'objet du soi, d'auto représentations, et de l'individuation dans la petite enfance. Puis une partie explore les zones dans lesquels Fordham apparemment divergeait de Jung, partie qui comporte un exposé de comment Fordham a trouvé un moyen de réconcilier ces divergences par son approche développementale. Ces zones comprennent: la définition du soi comme étant une totalité ou un archétype, la relation corps-esprit, l'«ultime», les origines des archétypes, et pour finir le soi primaire, le soi et le sens de soi. Pour conclure, l'auteur poursuit les propositions faites par Fordham pour résoudre l'incompatibilité des définitions de Jung. Ceci s'appuie sur le concept central de l'archétype de l'ordre et sur l'évidence de son développement vers la fin de la première année de l'enfant.

---

Diese Arbeit befasst sich mit Fordhams Beitrag zu Jungs Studien über das Selbst. Die Autorin beginnt mit den erkenntnistheoretischen Problemen, die mit diesem Thema verbunden sind, um dann einen Überblick über Fordhams Forschungen und darüber zu geben, wie Jung den Terminus 'Selbst' in manchmal unvereinbarer Weise benutzt. Fordhams Modell wird beschrieben: Es umfasst seine Konzepte von Primärem Selbst, Deintegration, Reintegration, Selbstobjekten, Selbstrepräsentationen sowie Individuation in der frühen Kindheit. In einem Abschnitt werden Bereiche diskutiert, in welchen die Ansichten Fordhams von denen Jungs offensichtlich abweichen, dann aber durch Fordhams entwicklungspsychologischen Ansatz wieder in Einklang gebracht werden.

---

<sup>7</sup> I should like to express my appreciation to David Crosher for pointing out these lines.

Zu diesen Bereichen zählen die Definition des Selbst als Ganzheit oder als Archetyp, die Beziehung zwischen Geist-Seele und Körper, das 'Ur-Eigentliche' (the 'ultimate'), die 'Ursprünge' der Archetypen und das Primäre Selbst, das Selbst sowie die Wahrnehmung des Selbst. Zum Schluss wird auf Fordhams Skizzierung einer Zusammenführung von Jungs unvereinbaren Definitionen hingewiesen. Sie beruht auf dem Konzept eines zentralen Archetyps der Ordnung und darauf, wie sich dessen Entfaltung gegen Ende des ersten Lebensjahres darstellt.

---

Questo lavoro riguarda il contributo di Fordham agli studi di Jung sul sé. Si apre con i dilemmi epistemologici inerenti al soggetto, prima di proseguire con un resoconto della ricerca di Fordham sui modi contraddittori in cui Jung usò il termine 'sé'. Vi è una descrizione del modello di Fordham, che copre i suoi concetti di sé primario, reintegrazione, deintegrazione, oggetti-sé, rappresentazione del sé e l'individuazione nell'infanzia. C'è una sessione che discute delle aree nelle quali Fordham apparentemente diverge da Jung, includendo anche il come queste si ricompongono nell'approccio evolutivo di Fordham. Tali aree comprendono la definizione del sé come totalità o archetipo, la relazione corpo-mente, la 'causa ultima', le origini degli archetipi, il sé primario, il sé e il senso del sé. Si conclude con un ampliamento delle linee tracciate da Fordham per una soluzione alle definizioni contraddittorie di Jung. Ciò porta al concetto dell'archetipo centrale dell'ordine e al come il suo emergere si evidenzia verso la fine del primo anno dell'infanzia.

---

Este trabajo es sobre las contribuciones de Fordham a los estudios de Jung sobre el Self. Se inicia con los dilemas epistemológicos inherentes al sujeto, antes de proseguir en un recuento de las investigaciones de Fordham sobre las vías contradictorias en las cuales usaba Jung el término, Self. Se hace una descripción del modelo de Fordham, este cubre sus conceptos del self primario, desintegración, reintegración, objetos del self, representaciones del self, e individuación en la infancia. Hay una sección donde se discuten áreas en las cuales Fordham aparentemente tiene divergencias con Jung, incluyendo aquellas que fueron replanteadas por Fordham en su aproximación desarrollista. Estas áreas incluye a la definición del self como totalidad o arquetipo: La relación mente cuerpo, lo 'ultimista', el origen de los arquetipos; y el self primario, el self y el sentir del self. Esto concluye con una ampliación de la idea de Fordham para resolver las definiciones incompatibles de Jung. Ello trae a colación el concepto de arquetipo central y de como su desarrollo se hace evidente hacia el final del primer año de la infancia.

## References

- Astor, J. (1987). 'Correspondence'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 32, 1.  
 — (1995). *Michael Fordham: Innovations in Analytical Psychology*. London: Routledge.  
 — (2004). 'The self-invented personality? Reflections on authenticity and writing analytic papers'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 50, 4.  
 Blackman, S. (1996). *The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bremner, J. (1994). *Infancy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Britton, R. (1998). *Belief and Imagination: Explorations in Psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge.
- Bullock, A. & Trombley, S. (2000). *The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*. London: Harper Collins.
- Canham, H. & Satyamurti, C. (2003). *Acquainted with the Night: Psychoanalysis and the Poetic Imagination*. London: Karnac.
- Carvalho, R. (1985). 'The self as primary integrate: some observations'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 30, 3.
- Colman, W. (1999). Personal letter to the author.
- (2000). 'Models of the Self'. *Jungian Thought in the Modern World*, eds. E. Christopher & H. Solomon. London: Free Association Books.
- Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' Error*. New York: Grossett/Putnam.
- (1999). *The Feeling of What Happens*. London: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Davies, M. (1993). 'Heroic deeds, manic defense and intrusive identification: some reflections on psychotherapy with a 16-year-old boy'. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy*, 19, 1.
- Day, R. & Wong, S. (1996). 'Anomalous perceptual asymmetries for negative emotional stimuli in the psychopath'. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 105, 648–52.
- Donne, J. (1633). 'Satire 3'. In *John Donne, The Complete English Poems*, ed. A. J. Smith. London: Penguin, 1982.
- Edelman, G. (1992). *Bright Air, Brilliant Fire*. London: Penguin Books.
- Fonagy, P., Gergely, G., Jurist, E. & Target, M. (2002). *Affect Regulation, Mentalization, and the Development of the Self*. New York: Other Press.
- Fordham, M. (1947). 'Integration, disintegration and early ego development'. *The Nervous Child*, 6, 3.
- (1957). *New Developments in Analytical Psychology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (1963). 'The empirical foundations and theories of the self in Jung's works'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 8, 1.
- (1964). 'The relation of the ego to the self'. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 37.
- (1969). *Children as individuals*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- (1976). *The Self and Autism*. London: Academic Press.
- (1985). *Explorations into the Self*. London: Academic Press.
- (1988). 'In discussion with Karl Figlio'. *Free Associations*, 12.
- (1993). *The Making of an Analyst*. London: Free Association Books.
- Fordham, M., Gordon, R., Hubback, J., Lambert, K. & Williams, M. (1973). *Analytical Psychology: A Modern Science*. London: Heinemann Medical Books.
- Frayn, M. (1998). *Copenhagen*. London: Methuen.
- Gordon, R. (1985). 'Big self and little self: some reflections'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 30, 3, 261–71.
- Hobson, R. (1961). Critical notice. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 6, 2.
- Jacoby, M. (2003). Personal communication.
- Johnson & Johnson (1998). *The Amazing Talents of the Newborn*. Johnson & Johnson Pediatric Institute.
- Jung, C. G. (1926). 'Spirit and life'. CW 8.
- (1931). *The Development of Personality*. CW 17.
- (1935a). 'The Tavistock Lectures'. CW 18.
- (1935b). 'Psychological Commentary on the Tibetan Book of the Dead'. CW 11.
- (1954). *Answer to Job*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (1963). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. London: Collins/Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- (1971). *Psychological Types*. *cw* 6.
- Knox, J. (2004). 'From archetypes to reflective function'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 49, 1.
- Piontelli, A. (1992). *From Fetus to Child: An Observational and Psychoanalytic Study*. London: Tavistock/Routledge.
- Schore, A. (2002). 'Clinical implications of a psychoneurobiological model of projective identification'. In *Primitive Mental States*, Vol. 2, ed. S. Alhanati. London: Karnac.
- Stern, D. (1985). *The Interpersonal World of the Infant*. New York: Basic Books.
- Urban, E. (1992). 'The primary self and related concepts in Jung, Klein, and Isaacs'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 37, 4, 411–32.
- Williams, M. & Waddell, M. (1991). *The Chamber of Maiden Thought: Literary Origins of the Psychoanalytic Model of the Mind*. London: Routledge.
- Young-Eisendrath, P. & Hall, J. (1987). *The Book of the Self*. London: New York University Press.
- Zinkin, L. (1986). 'Some thoughts on deintegration'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 31, 3.
- (1998). *Dialogue in the Analytic Setting*. Eds. H. Zinkin, R. Gordon & J. Haynes. London: Jessica Kingsley.

[Ms first received October 2004; final version July 2005]



Copyright of Journal of Analytical Psychology is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.